MATCH PROCESS

Background

• SAU meeting, Miami, January 2018
• Discussion topic x 4 sessions: Challenges of the match process

• Panelists:
  Mike Coburn
  Blake Hamilton
  Simone Thavasaleen
MATCH PROCESS

• Generated a list of challenges:
  • Who should run the match?
  • The match season is compressed into an almost impossible window with other conflicts (ISE, AUA abstracts, holidays, Section mtgs)
  • Applications (per person) have risen without any change in interview numbers
  • Uncoordinated and overlapping interview dates create a challenge for the applicants
  • Letters of Recommendation (LOR) are difficult to interpret
  • There is no objective assessment of skills/potential
  • Required 2nd visits create a burden and inequity for the applicants
MATCH PROCESS

- Task force assembled
  - Blake Hamilton (Univ. of Utah)
  - Jason Bylund (Univ. of Kentucky)
  - Kathleen Kobashi (Virginia- Mason)
  - James Brown (Univ. of Iowa)
  - Badrinath Konety (Univ. of Minnesota)
  - Gary Lemack (Texas-Southwestern)
CURRENT MATCH STATISTICS – OVERALL RESULTS

+ 21 %

- Positions offered
- Positions filled

Graph shows trends from 2013 to 2019 with a significant increase.
CURRENT MATCH STATISTICS – APPLICANT VIEW

- 10 %

+ 18 %

- Registered
- Submitted lists
- Ranked by programs
- Matched
- Not matched

CURRENT MATCH STATISTICS - INTERVIEWS
CURRENT MATCH STATISTICS - SUBGROUPS

Overall 85% 91%
78%
58%

US Seniors matched (%)
US Graduates matched (%)
Int's Graduates matched (%)
SURVEY ABOUT THE MATCH

• Sent to all members of SAU (n = 788)
• 6 questions/proposals:
  – Postpone match deadlines by 1 month
  – Move the ISE back 3-4 weeks
  – Limit applications to 40 per applicant
  – Use standardized LOR with brief narrative
  – Ban all official 2nd visits
  – Coordinate interviews by region
• Response rate: n = 142 / 18% (80 self-identified as Chair/PD)
• Separate project surveyed applicants (Lemack)
Match survey

My role is (check all that apply):

- Academic urol...
- Program direc...
- Department C...

My program size is:

- 1-2 residents ...
- 3-4 residents ...
- 5+ residents p...
Match survey

1. Should we postpone the match dates by 1 month?

Chairs/PDs

- Strongly agree: 7
- Agree: 21
- Neutral/Doesn't matter: 14
- Disagree: 0
- Strongly disagree: 0

All respondents

- Strongly agree: 45
- Agree: 40
- Neutral/Doesn't matter: 30
- Disagree: 15
- Strongly disagree: 0
Match survey
1. Should we postpone the match dates by 1 month?

*Pros*
- Gives same time to complete the process
- Less affected by the November conflicts
- Still finished before the NRMP deadline

*Cons*
- Doesn’t allow enough time for alternate plans for applicants who don’t match
- Still interferes with the November dates and brings December holidays into play

86% of applicants favor the early match
Match survey

1a. What if we lengthen the time window?

Pros

- Gives more time to complete the process—decompressed window
- Potentially allows applicants to interview at more programs
- Less affected by the November conflicts
- Still finished before the NRMP deadline
- Programs could interview more applicants, if they choose

Cons

- Drags out the process
- Does not require the applicants to prioritize as much
- Doesn’t benefit the lower tier candidates—the best candidates will just squeeze in more interviews
Match survey

2. Should we postpone the ISE by 1 month?

Chairs/PDs

All respondents

Would require significant effort for gains
Match survey

3. Should we limit the number of applications to 40?

Chairs/PDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/Doesn't</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/Doesn't</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENT MATCH STATISTICS - INTERVIEWS
Match survey

3. Should we limit the number of applications to 40?

**Pros**

- Less expensive for the applicants
- Applicants must choose selectively
- Fewer applications to evaluate by the programs
- Would not appear to affect the number of interviews completed by applicants

**Cons**

- Is it right to limit their choices?
- Does it help or hurt the applicant?
- Would it impact smaller programs? (i.e. would they receive too few applications?)

Faculty support this – suggest 20-40 (in comments)

Applicants favor a limit of 40-60

“Prisoner’s dilemma” in the ENT literature recommends 30 programs
Match survey

4. Should we use standardized LORs?

Chairs/PDs

- Strongly agree: 28
- Agree: 21
- Neutral/Doesn't matter: 14
- Disagree: 7
- Strongly disagree: 0

All respondents

- Strongly agree: 45
- Agree: 30
- Neutral/Doesn't matter: 15
- Disagree: 0
- Strongly disagree: 0
53% of applicants report being encouraged to make a 2nd visit
Match survey

6. Should we coordinate interviews by region?

Chairs/PDs

- Strongly agree: 16
- Agree: 24
- Neutral/Doesn't matter: 8
- Disagree: 16
- Strongly disagree: 8

All respondents

- Strongly agree: 30
- Agree: 45
- Neutral/Doesn't matter: 15
- Disagree: 30
- Strongly disagree: 15
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE MATCH

- High priority
  - Agree to a start date to extend interview invitations
    - e.g. October 1st
  - Discourage 2\textsuperscript{nd} looks (admittedly controversial)
  - Decrease the churning of interview invitations
    - limit applications? Other mechanism?
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE MATCH

• Medium priority
  – Standardization of Letters (LORs)
    • What is the standard? From another specialty?
    • There is not consensus on this
  – Regional coordination of dates
    • No infrastructure for this, but could encourage sections
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE MATCH

• Recommendations for non-action
  – Move the date for the ISE
  – Extend the timeline for the match